IANCOUVER. uroved For Release 2001/0000

STATIRFL

It's still not clear why Yalo's Soviet offices expert, Prof. Frederick Barghoom, had to spend two weeks in Moscow's Lubyanka prison,

Explanations vary.

It may have been an attempt by the Soviet police to grab someone they could exchange for the Soviet spies recently arrested in New York. Was it just a warning to visiting West-

em intellectuals to keep their noses out of Russian domestic affairs? Was it a warning to Russian intellectuals not to talk too freely with visitors?

Dr. Barghoorn was in Russia on a cultural exchange. He was gathering ma-terial for a book on political motivation and indoctrination in Soviet society.

These are matters anyone can study openly in a Western country. But they have to do with the springs of power. Under a dictatorship questions about such matters are sensitive.

Can such questions, put to the subjects of a dictatorship, be called spying?
In Communist terms, the answer would

seem to be yes. After all, communism

is noted for its subjective view of truth.
To the ideologically well-bred Marxist truth is not necessarily a matter capable of objective proof. He believes truth can be created by mere words, spoken by

the party clite.

J. Allen Dulles, former chief of the U.S. Central Intelligence Avency, once said 80 per cent of intelligence can be obtained through a foreign country's press or radio, or through the thousands of Americans, especially business or professional men, residing or travelling abroad.

Such men can't be called spies in the classic sense. They are just people withtheir eyes and ears open, reporting what they see, even as do newspapermen.

But in the totalitarian state, this is

Perhaps some devious Russian policy will some day be revealed as the motive for Professor Barghoorn's arrest. Failing this, the incident may be nothing more than another striking example of the differences between open and closed societies.